

we, in our turn, should give them a very small amount of our custom. Mr. S. G. Richardson moved: 'That this public meeting of the people of Sheffield, assembled in Paradise Square under the presidency of the mayor, protests against the prohibitory tariff proposed to be placed on British goods by the United States of America in return for the free market accorded in the United Kingdom to American products, and calls upon Her Majesty's Government to acquaint the President of the United States that such action, hostile and unfair as it is to the welfare of the manufacturing population of Great Britain and Ireland, is viewed with great disfavor in this country.' The resolution was carried with great enthusiasm."

WE beg to inform our very inexact contemporary, the *Montreal Herald*, that the figures given in a recent article in this journal anent the amounts received in Great Britain as customs revenues were obtained from fountain head—a Blue Book issued by the British Government. The *Herald* dodges the question. We had stated that the customs revenue of Great Britain was "derived chiefly from duties imposed upon the commonest necessities of life," and to this the *Herald* took exception, requesting a bill of particulars. We did not say that these duties were imposed upon all the necessities of life, or that many of them were not on the free list. We gave a list of all dutiable articles and the rate of duty imposed upon them; and we also gave a table showing the revenue derived from importations of these articles into Great Britain for the year ending March 31, 1889. These articles we classified in one class including tea, coffee, tobacco and dried fruit, the duty upon which aggregated £14,252,403; placing spirits, wines and all other imported articles in the other class, the duty upon which aggregated only £5,718,788. And now comes the *Herald* and replies that while it is true that tea and coffee may be regarded as necessities of life they are not so much so as some other articles which are free in Great Britain; and that tobacco is not a necessity to the average Britisher, but ranks with spirits and wines as a luxury. It also tells us that dried fruits are also luxuries. It moralizes upon the use of tobacco, claiming that it has hurtful tendencies; and mitigates the point regarding dried fruits by saying that the importations were small—last year the duty derived from this source amounted to nearly \$3,000,000. The weakness and ridiculousness of this denial is characteristic of anti Protectionists. We never intimated that sugar, breadstuffs, meats, clothing, tools, implements, etc., were not on the British free list, or that such things are not liable to duty when imported into Canada; and our contemporary should try to get the idea into its head that it is no "perversion of facts" to state certain established facts and not to state other similar facts. To avoid the force of our argument it classes tobacco and dried fruits as luxuries. This is enough to cause a smile to ripple over the countenance of the bronze statue of the Duke of Wellington.

IN a recent issue of this journal, alluding to the prevailing distress among the farmers of Dakota, we commented upon the "good face" our esteemed St. Louis contemporary *Farm Machinery* tried to put upon the matter. That journal republishes our remarks and comments thusly:—

Editor Cassidey shows his patriotism in the above. Canada has appreciated his work in the most substantial manner by recognizing him as the most influential trade journal in the

Dominion, and he has done a great deal in bringing the prosperity and possibilities of the country before the world. But any of us in our zeal are liable to overlook our own imperfections in a too intent search for flaws in our competitors. In fact, we are guilty of this to a more or less extent. The Dakotans have had a hard row to hoe, it is true, but if present indications can be depended upon they will have passed the worst days of the struggle after this year. The Dakotas are no longer an experiment; they are a certainty, and not only have thousands found homes in them, but also have hundreds made fortunes. Manitoba, beyond doubt, offers "fair fields and bright prospects" to farmers, and it would be strange indeed if Americans did not take advantage of them, for wherever money is to be made, there will the Yankee be found. But Canada is not all like Manitoba. Anyone who has ever traveled extensively through the Dominion could not be otherwise than impressed with the uninviting appearance of certain regions. Along some of the railroad lines can be seen mile after mile that do not present "fairer fields" by any means. Even if the Dakotas are all that the CANADIAN MANUFACTURER intimates, it must be acknowledged that American energy is not neglecting them. Can it be said that the Canadians are doing the same for every portion of Canada? There are States in the Union less favored by nature than others, but they are not passed by for that. And the day will come when irrigation will even make our desert bloom like a rose. If American farmers are going to Canada, then the CANADIAN MANUFACTURER has great cause for rejoicing, for the farmers will show its people what fearless enterprise, indefatigable work and Yankee ingenuity can accomplish. We don't begrudge them to our sister country. She is of the right sort, and neither ingratitude nor an unwillingness to learn can be numbered among her faults.

It gives Canadians no pleasure to know that any people are in distress, and all Canada sympathizes with the Dakotan farmers whose hard lot are driving them away from the homes they had fondly hoped to establish there. They have indeed "a hard row to hoe," and our information is that they have not passed the worst days of the desperate struggle. But a few days ago, on application from some of those suffering Dakota farmers, the Dominion Minister of Agriculture sent an agent to Dakota to arrange for a migration of farmers to Canada, where fairer fields and brighter prospects await them. All Canada will give these sturdy Americans a hearty Canadian welcome.

WE were greatly pleased, although somewhat surprised, to find quite a long article in the *London Advertiser* advocating the prosecution of the beet sugar industry in Ontario, and admitting that there is an abundant home market for the product of at least three factories. It is something new to find from this Free Trade organ that any manufacturing interest can prosper in Canada without free access to the sixty-million market south of us, through Commercial Union or Unrestricted Reciprocity. We welcome the admission, but would respectfully suggest to our esteemed contemporary that in treating a business subject like this, a little more care should be taken in preparing its figures. Those in the article in question are so glaringly incorrect, that they must have proved very bewildering to careful readers. It says that one factory, having a capacity to work 300 tons of beets per twenty four hours, giving a yield of ten per cent. in sugar, would yield a daily product of thirty tons of sugar, or in 120 days 72,000,000 pounds, or 36,000 tons. Clearly this should have been 7,200,000 pounds, or 3,600 tons. Again, the *Advertiser* says, "on the basis of a ten per cent. yield, it would require 360,000 tons of